

24 February 1959

COMMENTS ON NR-57

FINLAND

This appears to be aimed at a Focus type of audience, - that is, a comparatively unsophisticated audience. The article has little new insight or conclusion to present; it really is warmed-over generalities. This is a fundamental weakness for the NR, and one probably should question the article's use. It would seem to have been better if the author had provided an analysis in depth of a part or a feature of the Finnish situation.

Page 1.

Poor first sentence. Being on Soviet periphery is not adverse geographic but adverse strategic location.

First paragraph is a bit of a jumble.

Page 2.

Line one to two. Phrase about Finland reconciling itself is a pointless diversion and should be eliminated.

Line 9. Instead of citing mountains why not be specific about the barrier effects?

Line 14. "Has been maintained" should be "succeeded".

Page 3.

Footnote is ridiculous--eliminate.

Poor organization shows up here.

Who says Porkkala may have lost "some of" its military and strategic value? If true, its "return" was motivated by more complex reasons than this.

Page 4.

First paragraph is wordy and repetitive and is a new tack which is unconnected to foregoing matter by transition.

Page 5.

Top line. What population is referred to--wood industry or the overall Finnish population?

Page 6.

Line 13 and 14. This seems an unnecessary detail.

Page 7.

Top line. It does not seem proper to relate "which upset its economy", and drop the matter there.

Line 11 - 12. This is a type of sentence that is unworthy of competent editors.

The paragraph which follows does not seem to arrive anywhere conclusive.

Page 9.

Line 6 - 8. This states a possibility which, it would seem, has already been realized and which the article accepts.

Bad organization shows up here again.

Page 10 - 11.

This could be more political geography and less political reporting than it is.

What Finns feel their chances of surviving are good? This is not an acceptable generalism.

Persian Gulf Petroleum

This seems alright. The first paragraph of page two would seem to give too much attention to a tertiary point. Otherwise no particular comment.

Soviet Monographs

No criticism, article is the "Geographical Record" sort of thing found at the back of the Geographical Review and is worthwhile as reporting.

Polish Mapping

No criticism, same comment as for Soviet Monographs, but I felt this was the better of the two.

25X1A9a

